

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and the following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected as being obvious over Adachi. Adachi does not teach a control unit that brings a panel to a mirror surface state and turns off the power of the display portion when a key locked state is set. The Examiner acknowledges this and takes official notice that it is known to have "key lock or a key guard feature." There is nothing in the art (nor in the ordinary skill in the art), however, that suggests using the key lock feature to activate a mirror surface state.

First, Adachi uses a dedicated "switching switch 813" to switch to the mirror state. Indeed, this switch is labeled "M," which presumably represents "mirror." Adachi does not teach or suggest that any existing button or switch (such as a key lock button) could be used. Instead, Adachi adds a new button. Next, Adachi indicates that the image display status is automatically switched by an incoming call. ¶ 0341. On the basis of the Examiner's official notice, it is likely that Adachi's phone has a button or combination of buttons that activate a locked state. And still, with the understanding of automatic operation and the likely availability of a locked state, Adachi makes no mention of any link between the locked state and the mirror state.

To support the cited combination of teachings, the Examiner cites advantages of the combination, but these advantages would become apparent only **after** the combination is made. Nothing in the cited art suggests that the combination should be made in the first place. Indeed, the invention allows one to put the phone in the locked state and activate the mirror surface state in one step, whereas the teaching of the Adachi reference and the official notice would lead to

two buttons and two steps. Accordingly, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests using a key lock feature to bring a panel to a mirror surface state. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 3 stands rejected as being obvious over Adachi in view of Kamiya. Kamiya cannot be cited against the present application under 35 USC §§102/103. The filing date of the present application is May 23, 2003. Kamiya is a national stage application of an international application that was not published in English. Therefore, Kamiya has no §102(e) date and can be cited as a reference only under §§102(a) or (b). Kamiya's publication date is July 6, 2006, which is after Applicants' filing date. Therefore, Kamiya cannot be cited under §§102(a) or (b). Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected as being obvious over Adachi in view of Uyeno. The references do not teach bringing a panel to a transparent state and turning on the power of a display portion when there is an unrecognized call receiving history information or an unrecognized receiving mail as recited in claim 4. Nor do the references teach the doing the opposite when a recognition is performed according to claim 5. Uyeno is cited for turning on an indicia. The indicia taught by Uyeno, however, is simply a color-coded light or LCD. Col. 2, ln. 25–37. As shown in Fig. 1 of Uyeno, the indicia 15 are relatively small. These are not displays that one would be motivated to cover with mirror panels. Moreover, one would not be motivated to use Uyeno in a phone with key lock feature (as claimed) because Uyeno shows a “flip” phone, which does not require a locked state to protect against accidental activation of keys. Therefore, the cited art does not suggest the limitations of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Appln. No. 10/518,192
Response dated November 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated August 8, 2006

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 37288.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:



Michael W. Garvey – Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: November 2, 2006